

REMARKS

The Office Action dated October 2, 2009 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment and following remarks have been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-22, 24, 25, 28-34, 36, 38-43, 45, and 46 are now pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-22, 24-36, and 38-46 stand rejected. Claims 3, 11, 23, 26, 27, 35, 37, and 44 have been canceled

The rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-22, 24-36, and 38-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,668,279 to Curtis (hereinafter referred to as "Curtis") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,826,594 to Pettersen (hereinafter referred to as "Pettersen"), and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,061,603 to Papadopoulos et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Papadopoulos") is respectfully traversed.

Curtis describes a web server (202) that includes an in-kernel cache (204) that is managed by a data transport module (206). The web server (202) receives HTTP requests from multiple clients (100) and (102). The data transport module (206) places an object containing the HTTP request in an upcall thread queue (214). An upcall thread (216) then obtains the HTTP request from the upcall thread queue (214) and invokes a method implemented by the HTTP daemon (210). The HTTP daemon (210) returns an HTTP response and/or directives to control information that is stored in the in-kernel cache (204) or to control a flow of information that is transmitted to the clients (100) or (102). This information is sent to the data transport module (206) via a downcall door (220). Notably, Curtis does not describe or suggest a web and file transfer system configured to enable a user to configure at least one web and file transfer connection of a plurality of web and file transfer connections and disable the plurality of web and file transfer connections when the user does not configure the at least one web and file transfer connection.

Pettersen describes a method for inserting dynamic content into a web page (793). A web page owner defines one or more zones of web page (793) as remotely managed, and then connects the web page (793) to a content serving web site (780) in order to manage the zones

by identifying dynamic content to be inserted in the zones. By way of an affiliate browser (792), a user at an affiliated web site (790) accesses a zone content database (785) to alter a file (787) associated with a tag ID (786) owned by the affiliate. The affiliated web site (790) and the content serving web site (780) each have a web server (791) and (781). In response to a request from a user system browser (762), the content serving web site (780) looks up the file (787) associated with the dynamic content from the zone content database (785), using the tag ID (786) as a key, and sends the file (787) to a user system (760). Notably, Pettersen does not describe or suggest a web and file transfer system configured to enable a user to configure at least one web and file transfer connection of a plurality of web and file transfer connections and disable the plurality of web and file transfer connections when the user does not configure the at least one web and file transfer connection.

Papadopoulos describes a process control system (6) that allows a user (2) to access a programmable logic controller (PLC) (32). A web server (30) provides a direct connection for the PLC (32) to the Internet (14) by plugging the web server (30) into a backplane (34). The web server (30) and the PLC (32) are separate components of the process control system (6). Notably, Papadopoulos does not describe or suggest a web and file transfer system configured to enable a user to configure at least one web and file transfer connection of a plurality of web and file transfer connections and disable the plurality of web and file transfer connections when the user does not configure the at least web and file transfer connection.

Claim 1 recites a web-enabled automation control module (ACM) that includes “a web and file transfer system directly electrically connected, without using a backplane, to said ACM CPU, said web and file transfer system embedded within said ACM, said web and file transfer system comprising a web server, a file transfer server, and a database, said web and file transfer system configured to: receive from a network a plurality of user-defined web page files, at least one of the plurality of user-defined web page files comprising at least one ACM tag function that facilitates an exchange of ACM data between said web server and said ACM CPU system memory; store the plurality of user-defined web page files in said database; receive, from the network, a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) request to send a first user-defined web page file of the plurality of user-defined web page files to the network;

process the HTTP request; access the first user-defined web page file referenced in the HTTP request; parse the first user-defined web page file for the at least one ACM tag function; execute the at least one ACM tag function using form data from the HTTP request to transmit ACM data to said ACM CPU to control operation of said ACM; enable a user to configure at least one web and file transfer connection of a plurality of web and file transfer connections; and disable the plurality of web and file transfer connections when the user does not configure the at least one web and file transfer connection.”

No combination of Curtis, Pettersen, and Papadopoulos describes or suggests a web-enabled ACM, as recited in Claim 1. More specifically, no combination of Curtis, Pettersen, and Papadopoulos describes or suggests a web and file transfer system configured to enable a user to configure at least one web and file transfer connection of a plurality of web and file transfer connections and disable the plurality of web and file transfer connections when the user does not configure the at least one web and file transfer connection. The Examiner alleges that Curtis describes at column 2, lines 54-65 an ACM system configured to disable web and file TCP connections when a user configures zero of the web and file transfer TCP connections. Applicants respectfully disagree. Contrary to the Examiner’s allegation, Curtis merely describes at column 2, lines 54-65 that “HTTP request data may be sent with a preempt indicator from the data transport module to a HTTP daemon. The preempt indicator indicates whether processing is preempted from the data transport module to the HTTP daemon. Similarly, when a HTTP response is returned from the HTTP daemon to the data transport module, HTTP response data may be sent with a preempt indicator from the HTTP daemon to the data transport module indicating whether processing is preempted from the HTTP daemon to the data transport module.” Nowhere does Curtis describe or suggest a user being able to configure at least one web and file transfer connections or that web and file transfer connections are disabled when the user does not configure them. Further, Pettersen merely describes a content serving web site that looks up a file associated with dynamic content in a zone content database, and sends the file to a user system in response to a request from a user, and Papadopoulos merely describes a web server that provides a connection between a PLC and the Internet, wherein all signals between the PLC and the web server are through a back plane.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Curtis in view of Pettersen, and further in view of Papadopoulos.

Claims 2, 4-10, 12, 45, and 46 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 2, 4-10, 12, 45, and 46 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 2, 4-10, 12, 45, and 46 likewise are patentable over Curtis in view of Pettersen, and further in view of Papadopoulos.

Claim 13 recites an automation control module (ACM) system that includes a web and file transfer subsystem configured to “enable said user to configure at least one web and file transfer TCP connection of a plurality of web and file transfer TCP connections using said computer; and disable said plurality of web and file transfer TCP connections when none of the plurality of web and file transfer TCP connections are configured.”

No combination of Curtis, Pettersen, and Papadopoulos describes or suggests an automation control module (ACM) system, as recited in Claim 13. More specifically, no combination of Curtis, Pettersen, and Papadopoulos describes or suggests a web and file transfer subsystem configured to enable a user to configure at least one web and file transfer TCP connection of a plurality of web and file transfer TCP connections using a computer, and disable the plurality of web and file transfer TCP connections when none of the plurality of web and file transfer TCP connections are configured. The Examiner alleges that Curtis describes at column 2, lines 54-65 an ACM system configured to disable web and file TCP connections when a user configures zero of the web and file transfer TCP connections. Applicants respectfully disagree. Contrary to the Examiner’s allegation, Curtis merely describes at column 2, lines 54-65 that “HTTP request data may be sent with a preempt indicator from the data transport module to a HTTP daemon. The preempt indicator indicates whether processing is preempted from the data transport module to the HTTP daemon. Similarly, when a HTTP response is returned from the HTTP daemon to the data transport module, HTTP response data may be sent with a preempt indicator from the HTTP daemon to the data transport module indicating whether processing is preempted from the HTTP daemon to the data transport module.” Nowhere does Curtis describe or suggest a user being able to configure at least one web and file transfer connection or that web and file transfer

connections are disabled when the user does not configure them. Further, Pettersen describes a content serving web site that looks up a file associated with dynamic content in a zone content database, and sends the file to a user system in response to a request from a user, and Papadopoulos merely describes a web server that provides a connection between a PLC and the Internet, wherein all signals between the PLC and the web server are through a back plane.

Accordingly, Claim 13 is submitted to be patentable over Curtis in view of Pettersen, and further in view of Papadopoulos.

Claims 14-22, 24, and 25 depend from independent Claim 13. When the recitations of Claims 14-22, 24, and 25 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 13, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 14-22, 24, and 25 likewise are patentable over Curtis in view of Pettersen, and further in view of Papadopoulos.

Claim 28 recites a method for management and control of an automation control module (ACM) that includes “enabling a user to configure at least one web and file transfer connection of a plurality of web and file transfer connections; and disabling the plurality of web and file transfer connections when the user does not configure the at least one web and file transfer connection.”

No combination of Curtis, Pettersen, and Papadopoulos describes or suggests a method for management and control of an ACM, as recited in Claim 28. More specifically, no combination of Curtis, Pettersen, and Papadopoulos describes or suggests enabling a user to configure at least one web and file transfer connection of a plurality of web and file transfer connections and disabling the plurality of web and file transfer connections when the user does not configure the at least one web and file transfer connection. The Examiner alleges that Curtis describes at column 2, lines 54-65 an ACM system configured to disable web and file TCP connections when a user configures zero of the web and file transfer TCP connections. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner alleges that Curtis describes at column 2, lines 54-65 an ACM system configured to disable web and file TCP connections when a user configures zero of the web and file transfer TCP connections. Applicants

respectfully disagree. Contrary to the Examiner's allegation, at column 2, lines 54-65, Curtis merely describes that "HTTP request data may be sent with a preempt indicator from the data transport module to a HTTP daemon. The preempt indicator indicates whether processing is preempted from the data transport module to the HTTP daemon. Similarly, when a HTTP response is returned from the HTTP daemon to the data transport module, HTTP response data may be sent with a preempt indicator from the HTTP daemon to the data transport module indicating whether processing is preempted from the HTTP daemon to the data transport module." Nowhere does Curtis describe or suggest a user being able to configure at least one web and file transfer connections or that web and file transfer connections are disabled when the user does not configure them. Further, Pettersen describes a content serving web site that looks up a file associated with dynamic content in a zone content database, and sends the file to a user system in response to a request from a user, and Papadopoulos merely describes a web server that provides a connection between a PLC and the Internet, wherein all signals between the PLC and the web server are through a back plane.

Accordingly, Claim 28 is submitted to be patentable over Curtis in view of Pettersen, and further in view of Papadopoulos.

Claims 29-32 depend from independent Claim 28. When the recitations of Claims 29-32 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 28, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 29-32 likewise are patentable over Curtis in view of Pettersen, and further in view of Papadopoulos.

Claim 36 recites a method for management and control of an automation control module (ACM) using an ACM system that includes "enabling a user to configure at least one web and file transfer connection of a plurality of web and file transfer connections; and disabling the plurality of web and file transfer connections when the user does not configure the at least one web and file transfer connection."

No combination of Curtis, Pettersen, and Papadopoulos describes or suggests a method for management and control of an automation control module (ACM) using an ACM

system, as recited in Claim 36. More specifically, no combination of Curtis, Pettersen, and Papadopoulos describes or suggests enabling a user to configure at least one web and file transfer connection of a plurality of web and file transfer connections and disabling the plurality of web and file transfer connections when the user does not configure the at least one web and file transfer connection. The Examiner alleges that Curtis describes at column 2, lines 54-65 an ACM system configured to disable web and file TCP connections when a user configures zero of the web and file transfer TCP connections. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner alleges that Curtis describes at column 2, lines 54-65 an ACM system configured to disable web and file TCP connections when a user configures zero of the web and file transfer TCP connections. Applicants respectfully disagree. Contrary to the Examiner's allegation, at column 2, lines 54-65, Curtis merely describes that "HTTP request data may be sent with a preempt indicator from the data transport module to a HTTP daemon. The preempt indicator indicates whether processing is preempted from the data transport module to the HTTP daemon. Similarly, when a HTTP response is returned from the HTTP daemon to the data transport module, HTTP response data may be sent with a preempt indicator from the HTTP daemon to the data transport module indicating whether processing is preempted from the HTTP daemon to the data transport module." Nowhere does Curtis describe or suggest a user being able to configure at least one web and file transfer connections or that web and file transfer connections are disabled when the user does not configure them. Further, Pettersen describes a content serving web site that looks up a file associated with dynamic content in a zone content database, and sends the file to a user system in response to a request from a user, and Papadopoulos merely describes a web server that provides a connection between a PLC and the Internet, wherein all signals between the PLC and the web server are through a back plane.

Accordingly, Claim 36 is submitted to be patentable over Curtis in view of Pettersen, and further in view of Papadopoulos.

Claims 38-43 depend from independent Claim 36. When the recitations of Claims 38-44 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 36, Applicants submit that

dependent Claims 38-44 likewise are patentable over Curtis in view of Pettersen, and further in view of Papadopoulos.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-22, 24-36, and 38-46 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric T. Kriskhe
Registration No. 42,769
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070